

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the thorough examination of the present application. The Office Action, however, rejected all claims 1-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. patent no. 6,182,142 to Win et al. (hereafter Win). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicant disagrees and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections. In this regard, Applicant has made minor, clarifying amendments to some of the claims (support for which can be found in the specification in at least page 27, lines 5-15).

Fundamental Distinction of U.S. Patent 6,182,142

As set forth below, there are significant differences and distinctions between the presently claimed embodiments and the system disclosed by Win. As described in the present specification, the claimed embodiments are directed to general-purpose Web server algorithms for re-directing a Web user back to a page that the user was trying to access after some prerequisite for accessing the page (which was not satisfied at first) has become satisfied. The claimed embodiments are not limited to login or authorization matters, but more broadly to a variety of page requests that must be temporarily deferred or suspended, until some kind of pre-requisite has been satisfied. Suppose, for example, page X requires the user to have viewed a terms-and-conditions page first, and the user tries to access page X directly without having satisfied that pre-requisite. An embodiment of the invention interrupts the user's request for page X, sending the user elsewhere to view the terms-and-conditions page, and then resumes the user's interrupted request for X (without the user having to manually navigate back to page X himself) once the terms-and-conditions page has been viewed. No such teachings or solutions are disclosed, or even contemplated, in Win.

These and other differences will be pointed out below, in connection with the individual claims.

Discussion of Claims 1-11

The Office Action rejected claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by Win. For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicant disagrees and requests reconsideration of the rejections.

Claim 1 recites:

1. A method implemented at a Web server for controlling the resumption of access to a World Wide Web page to be supplied by the Web server and requiring at least one prerequisite, the method comprising:
 receiving and evaluating a current HTTP request from a Web client to determine whether a previously unsatisfied prerequisite has been satisfied;
retrieving from a stored location information related to re-requesting a target HTTP request previously interrupted by the prerequisite, if the receiving and evaluating step determines that a previously unsatisfied prerequisite has been satisfied;
forming an HTTP response, which response includes contents for re-requesting from the Web client the target HTTP request; and
 transmitting the response to the Web client that transmitted the current HTTP request.

(Emphasis added.) Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 patently defines over Win for at least the reason that Win fails to disclose the features emphasized (bold and italics) above.

In addition to the fundamental distinction summarized above, Applicant submits that additional distinctions define claim 1 over Win. For example, the Office Action has relied upon col. 2, lines 41-65 and col. 3, lines 34-36 as allegedly disclosing the “retrieving...” element. Applicant respectfully disagrees. In fact, this cited portion of Win actually states:

One feature of this aspect is the steps of defining a role of the user; and storing an association of the user to the role at the second server. A related feature is the steps of defining one or more roles and functional groups of an organization to which the user belongs; storing information describing the roles and functional groups in association with information describing the user; and determining whether the user may access the resource based on the information describing the roles and functional groups.

According to another feature, the identifying step further comprises the steps of connecting the first server to the second server, in which the second server stores information describing the user, one or more roles, one or more

functional groups, the resources, and associations among them; and communicating a request for a profile of the user from the first server to the second server. In another feature, the receiving step further comprises the steps of receiving the information describing the user at a runtime module on the first server that also intercepts requests to access the resource. In yet another feature, the step of identifying further comprises the step of determining whether the user is authentic. A related feature is that the step of identifying further comprises the steps of communicating encrypted information between the first server and the second server describing resources that the user is authorized to use.

...

... determining, based on the one or more tokens, whether the client is authorized to use the one of the resources ...

As can be readily verified from even a cursory review of the above-quoted portions of Win, the relevant features of claim 1 are not disclosed anywhere therein.

More particularly, claim 1 recites the step of "retrieving from a stored location information related to re-requesting a target HTTP request previously interrupted by the prerequisite". This essentially involves retrieving the URL and any meta-data (*e.g.*, form parameters) for the page that the user was originally trying to access. Lines 41-49 of Win form a paragraph describing how that system stores role and functional group information for the user and defines to which pages those roles and groups allow access. The remaining lines (lines 50-65) form a second paragraph describing how that system stores user, role, and functional group information, communicates that information between the various server components of the system, and uses that information as a basis for authenticating user requests. Significantly, however, there is nothing disclosed about retrieving previously saved information related to re-requesting a previously interrupted target page (*e.g.*, its URL, form parameters, etc.), as defined in claim 1. For at least this reason the rejection of claim 1 is misplaced and should be withdrawn.

As a separate and independent basis for the patentability of claim 1, the Office Action relied upon col. 8, lines 40-55 as allegedly teaching the "forming ..." element. Applicant

respectfully disagrees. The "forming ..." element of claim 1 essentially involves sending the URL (and meta-data), that has been previously saved and retrieved for the page the user was originally trying to access, back to the user so that the page can be automatically re-opened by the client browser. In contrast, the cited portion of Win states:

...If the conditions are not satisfied, then the user cannot be authenticated, and as shown in state 314, Runtime Module 206 returns a redirection to the Login URL. As shown by state 316, HTTP Server 202 returns the redirection to the Login URL to the browser 100.

FIG. 3C is a state diagram showing processes carried out when the URL is a protected resource and the user is authenticated. After the user has been authenticated in state 312, Runtime Module 206 calls the Authorization Verification Service to check that the user has the right to access the protected resource. All authenticated users have the right to access "public" resources. In state 318, the Runtime Module 206 tests whether the resource is a public resource. If so, then Runtime Module 206 returns a direction to one or more resource pages, and HTTP Server 202 returns the redirection to browser 100, as shown by state 308.

As can be readily verified from even a cursory reading of the cited portion of Win, this teaching of Win merely teaches the redirection of a user to a login page, when the user is not logged-in (lines 40-44) and letting the user proceed on to the page he is trying to access when he is already logged-in and the page is public (lines 45-55). Significantly, however, this portion of Win does not teach the target page resumption that is embodied in claim 1. In this regard, this portion of the Win patent is describing the situation where a user is trying to access the page in the first place and the pre-requisites (login and authorization) are already satisfied. In contrast, the relevant element of claim 1 is concerned with the situation where such initial access fails so that, after the pre-requisite does eventually become satisfied, the user's original request is automatically resumed. That automatic resumption of a interrupted original request (what the claim refers to as the "target") is what claim 1 defines (and not the fulfillment of a request that already satisfies all the pre-requisites so never needs to be interrupted in the first place). For at least this separate and independent reason, the rejection of claim 1 is misplaced and should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-11 each depend from claim 1 and patently define over Win for at least the same reasons as claim 1. In addition, these claims define additional features that are not disclosed or suggested in Win. For example, claim 10 defines: "... wherein the HTTP response formed includes content to cause the Web client to automatically re-request the target HTTP request." Likewise, claim 11 defines: "... wherein the HTTP response formed includes content to inform and allow the user of the Web client to optionally re-request the target HTTP request."

With regard to claim 10, the Office Action again relied upon col. 8, lines 40-55 (quoted above) for allegedly disclosing the element of claim 11. However, there is absolutely no teaching in this portion of Win that discloses the forming of an HTTP response to include "content to cause the Web client to automatically re-request the target HTTP request," as specifically recited by claim 10. For at least this additional reason, the rejection of claim 10 is misplaced and should be withdrawn.

With regard to claim 11, the Office Action relied upon col. 6, lines 6-24 as allegedly teaching the claimed subject matter. Applicant respectfully disagrees. This portion of Win states:

The system 2 also enables Users to log-in to the system once, and thereafter access one or more Resources during an authenticated session. Users may log in either with a digital certificate or by opening a login page URL with a web browser and entering a name and password. In the past, users have had to log in individually to each Web application that they are authorized to use. In the preferred embodiment, users always access the same login page regardless of the number of resources to which they need access. Thus, the system provides a mechanism of single secure log-in to Web resources.

If the login attempt is successful, the system 2 presents the User with a Personalized Menu that assists the User in identifying and selecting a Resource. In one embodiment, a Personalized Menu is an HTML page containing a list of authorized Resources. The Personalized Menu displays only Resources to which the User has access. The User can then select and access a Resource.

As can be readily verified from the above-quoted portion of Win, there is no teaching or disclosure of the claimed forming of an HTTP response to include “content to inform and allow the user of the Web client to optionally re-request the target HTTP request.” In particular, a Personalized Menu listing available Resource options is not the same thing as a page inviting the user specifically to repeat his original request (right down to even the original request form parameters) and providing an option to do that, as claimed in the present application. For at least this separate and independent reason, the rejection of claim 11 should be withdrawn.

Discussion of claims 12-21

The Office Action, however, rejected claims 12-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by Win. For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicant disagrees and requests reconsideration of the rejections.

Claim 12 recites:

12. A method implemented at a Web server for controlling the interruption of access to a World Wide Web page to be supplied by the Web server and requiring at least one prerequisite, the method comprising:
 receiving and evaluating a current HTTP request from a Web client to determine whether an unsatisfied prerequisite exists;
 saving to a stored location information related to re-requesting the current HTTP request, if the receiving and evaluating step determines that an unsatisfied prerequisite exists;
 forming an HTTP response, which response omits desired contents from a location specified by the current HTTP request; and
 transmitting the response to the Web client that transmitted the current HTTP request.

(*Emphasis added.*) Applicant respectfully submits that claim 12 patently defines over Win for at least the reason that Win fails to disclose the features emphasized (bold and italics) above.

In addition to the fundamental distinction summarized above, Applicant submits that additional distinctions define claim 12 over Win. For example, the Office Action has again relied upon col. 2, lines 41-65 and col. 10, lines 6-12 as allegedly teaching the “saving ... “ element. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

As noted above in connection with the rejection of claim 1, lines 41-49 of Win form a paragraph describing how that system stores role and functional group information for the user and defines to which pages those roles and groups allow access. The remaining lines (lines 50-65) form a second paragraph describing how that system stores user, role, and functional group information, communicates that information between the various server components of the system, and uses that information as a basis for authenticating user requests. Significantly, however, there is nothing disclosed about saving information related to re-requesting the current HTTP request to a stored location.

With regard to the teaching of col. 10, lines 6-12, Win states:

For each login attempt, the Login Tracking Service logs the user's login activity. It saves the time of last successful and unsuccessful logins and number of consecutive, unsuccessful login attempts. The last successful and unsuccessful login times are displayed to the user after each successful login. Users can thus detect if someone else has attempted to use their account.

Again, there is no disclosure here of the claimed subject matter. In this regard, the relevant feature of claim 12 recites “saving to a stored location information related to re-requesting the current HTTP request.” This essentially involves saving the URL and any meta-data (*e.g.*, form parameters) for the page that the user was originally trying to access, so that it can be offered to the client later when the particular pre-requisite is satisfied (*e.g.*, as per the method of claim 1). This cited portion of Win is irrelevant to such a teaching and for at least this reason, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 13-21 each depend from claim 12 and the rejections to these claims should be withdrawn for at least the same reasons.

Claims 22-27

The Office Action, however, rejected claims 22-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by Win. For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicant disagrees and requests reconsideration of the rejections.

Claim 22 recites:

22. A Web server for controlling the resumption of access to a World Wide Web page to be supplied by the Web server and requiring at least one prerequisite, the Web server comprising:
a first mechanism configured to evaluate a current HTTP request from a Web client to determine whether a previously unsatisfied prerequisite has been satisfied;
a second mechanism configured to retrieve from a stored location information related to re-requesting a target HTTP request previously interrupted by the prerequisite, in response to the first mechanism determining that a previously unsatisfied prerequisite has been satisfied;
a third mechanism configured to form an HTTP response, which response includes contents for re-requesting from the Web client the target HTTP request; and
a fourth mechanism configured to transmit the response to the Web client that transmitted the current HTTP request.

(*Emphasis added*). Applicant respectfully submits that claim 22 patently defines over Win for at least the reason that Win fails to disclose the features emphasized (bold and italics) above.

Claim 22 is an apparatus claim defining elements that loosely correspond to the elements of method claim 1. Indeed, the rationale for the rejection of claim 22 closely parallels the rationale for the rejection of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of independent claim 22 (and dependent claims 23-27) should be withdrawn for at least the same reason as the rejection of claim 1.

Claims 28-29

The Office Action, however, rejected claims 28-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by Win. For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicant disagrees and requests reconsideration of the rejections.

Claim 28 recites:

28. A Web server for controlling the interruption of access to a World Wide Web page to be supplied by the Web server and requiring at least one prerequisite, the Web server comprising:

a first mechanism configured to evaluate a current HTTP request from a Web client to determine whether an unsatisfied prerequisite exists;

a second mechanism configured to save to a stored location information related to re-requesting the current HTTP request, in response to the first mechanism determining that an unsatisfied prerequisite exists;

a third mechanism configured to form an HTTP response, which response omits desired contents from a location specified by the current HTTP request; and

a fourth mechanism configured to transmit the response to the Web client that transmitted the current HTTP request.

(Emphasis added). Applicant respectfully submits that claim 28 patently defines over Win for at least the reason that Win fails to disclose the features emphasized (bold and italics) above.

Claim 28 is an apparatus claim defining elements that loosely correspond to the elements of method claim 12. Indeed, the rationale for the rejection of claim 28 closely parallels the rationale for the rejection of claim 12. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of independent claim 28 (and dependent claim 29) should be withdrawn for at least the same reason as the rejection of claim 12.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all pending claims are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

No fee is believed to be due in connection with this Amendment and Response to Office Action. If, however, any fee is deemed to be payable, you are hereby authorized to charge any such fee to Hewlett-Packard Company's Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Daniel R. McClure', written over a horizontal line.

Daniel R. McClure
Registration No. 38,962
(770) 933-9500

Please continue to send all future correspondence to:

Hewlett-Packard Development Company, L.P.
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400